

1 IN RE:

2 HEARING-FOR PROPOSED PLAN
3 SUPERFUND PROGRAM

4 AVCO Lycoming Site
5 Williamsport, PA
6
7

8 TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING held at the Sheraton,
9 Williamsport, PA, on Thursday, May 2, 1991.
10

11
12 Reported by:
13 Dawn M. Sweeley
14 Official Reporter
15 Lycoming County, PA
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

AR500001

1 (The meeting began at 7:07 p.m.)

2 MS. BARNETT:

3 I am going to go ahead and start. We have a few
4 minutes after seven and I would like to get started.

5 First of all, thank you for coming. My name is Amy
6 Barnett and I am a community relations coordinator for the
7 Environmental Protection Agency for the Avco Lycoming Superfund
8 Site. That is what we are here to talk about tonight,
9 specifically the proposed clean-up alternatives for the
10 groundwater underneath the Avco Lycoming Superfund Site. If
11 anyone did not get a copy of the proposed clean-up alternatives
12 explanation, also called the proposed plan, we have some in the
13 back there. You can get up and get one or somebody will bring
14 them to you if you raise your hand.

15 In addition to myself tonight, we have here to my
16 left Eugene Dennis, who's the remedial project manager for the
17 Avco Lycoming Superfund Site. We also have Nancy Cichowicz
18 who's a hydrogeologist for the Avco Lycoming site. We have Deb
19 Forman who is the toxicologist for the site, and then we have
20 Jeff Pike who's the chief of the Western Pennsylvania Remedial
21 Section. And then we also have state officials in the audience.
22 We have some members of the media as well.

23 Our agenda tonight and after this brief introduction
24 Eugene Dennis is going to give a short presentation of all the
25 possible clean-up alternatives for the Avco Lycoming

AR500002

1 groundwater, and he's also going to go over what EPA's preferred
2 alternative is at this time, at this point, so we are here
3 tonight to take comments on any of the alternatives as well as
4 on the preferred alternative, and we have a good three hours to
5 answer any questions that anybody has, so we'd be happy to have
6 you ask anything you'd like to know.

7 One thing we do ask, however, is that if you would
8 wait until Eugene Dennis finishes his presentation. One of the
9 reasons I ask that is that if you have a question in the
10 beginning of the presentation he may actually have answered it
11 by the time he finishes. We want to make sure we get all the
12 information out to you we have tonight. No question is too
13 silly. If you're wondering about something, chances are
14 somebody else wants to know the same thing, and we'll try very
15 hard to answer all the questions we get tonight right here and
16 now. However, some questions, if they are very technical in
17 nature or something like that, may take some research back in
18 the office, and I would be happy to coordinate getting back in
19 touch with people to give them answers to their questions.

20 The questions and comments that we get here tonight
21 are going to be addressed in something called a responsiveness
22 summary, and that will be attached to the back of the decision
23 document. In other words, when EPA based on public comments and
24 and all the other information we have includes the clean-up
25 alternative for the groundwater, that will be in something

AB500003

1 called a record of the decision. The responsiveness summary
2 responding formally to questions and comments will be attached
3 to that record of decision.

4 The comment period for the Avco Lycoming groundwater
5 alternatives runs from April 17th of this year until May 16th of
6 this year, so if you want to send in any written comments,
7 please have them postmarked on or before the 16th of this month,
8 16th of May. We also, to my right, have somebody recording the
9 proceedings here because we want to make sure we get all the
10 comments down so we can address them, and because of that, if
11 you have a question or a comment, raise your hand and I will
12 recognize you. Then if you could please state your name before
13 you say what you have to say or ask a question, and if somebody
14 does forget to state their name I'll remind you. It will make
15 it a lot easier for the stenographer if we state our names.

16 You can send any comments that you may have, any
17 written comments to my address which is in the copy of the
18 proposed plan, Amy Barnett. It's on page 16, and you can send
19 any comments there. My phone number is also there so if
20 something comes up after the meeting in the next two weeks or
21 so, then please feel free to call me at that number. Also, make
22 sure that if you would like to see more technical information
23 about the site you can see that at the James V. Brown Public
24 Library. In addition, at that library EPA has placed something
25 called an administrative record. The administrative record is a

AR500004

1 collection of all the documents that EPA has used to come up
2 with possible clean-up alternatives, come up with possible
3 clean-up alternatives in this case for the groundwater.

4 Again, if anybody would like to call me after the
5 meeting, my phone number is in the proposed plan. Also, if you
6 would like to be on our mailing list to continue to receive
7 information in the future about the site through the mail,
8 please sign your name, put your address in the sign-in sheet in
9 the back. If you don't feel like being a part of the mailing
10 list, if you could, just initial the mailing list so that --
11 initial the sign-in sheet so we can see how many people were
12 here. That would help a lot.

13 At this point I'd like to introduce Eugene Dennis
14 who's going to talk to us about the alternatives.

15 MR. DENNIS:

16 Good evening. Thank you for coming. My name is
17 Eugene Dennis. Before I get into the alternatives that we've
18 selected I'd like to briefly go over a summary of how we got to
19 this point. Very quickly, in 1984 the Williamsport Municipal
20 Water Authority identified the presence of vinyl chloride in the
21 well field, notified DER, Pennsylvania Department of
22 Environmental Resources, who took action and conducted a study.

23 In 1985 Avco -- I'll use Avco and Textron
24 interchangeably throughout the meeting, conducted additional
25 studies at the site to determine the nature and extent of the

AR500005

1 contamination. In November of '85 Avco Lycoming and PADER
2 entered into a consent or agreement to conduct yet additional
3 further groundwater studies and to perform the remedial action.
4 In May of '86 the remedial action plan was approved by the state
5 and included on site and off site groundwater recovery and
6 treatment, as well as bi-monthly groundwater monitoring.

7 January of '87 the Textron Lycoming facility was
8 proposed for the national priorities list, which basically is
9 the list of the nation's high priority hazardous waste sites.
10 In June of '88 a consent or an agreement was entered into
11 between Textron Lycoming and EPA essentially requiring the
12 facility to conduct a remedial session and feasibility study.
13 In August of '89 the RIFC's study work plans were approved. The
14 federal work was initiated. In February of '90 Textron Lycoming
15 was placed on a national priorities list.

16 That leads us to this point. After eighteen months
17 of conducting the groundwater investigation, we have received
18 draft reports of the remedial investigation and feasibility
19 study, and based on those reports the agency has developed a
20 list of clean-up alternatives or remedial alternatives which we
21 think will best address the contamination problem in the
22 groundwater at the site.

23 Before I get into the exact alternatives, I'd like to
24 at least show, based on the results of the remedial
25 investigation, I have identified groundwater contamination that

AR500006

1 extends beyond the property boundry which stops here and goes as
2 far down as Lycoming Creek and the Elm Park area. This is
3 basically a trichloroethylene, dichloroethylene plume. We also
4 have identified inorganic contamination, basically chromium,
5 that existed in the western portion of the property, strictly
6 confined to the on site portion of the site. Again, based on
7 the results we've identified six alternatives which range from
8 no action, which basically would mean that we would shut off the
9 existing groundwater recovery and treatment systems that are now
10 operating on the facility and do nothing, and that obviously
11 that would come in at a cost of nothing.

12 To address the groundwater we have the next
13 alternative identified as the GW-1 or groundwater 1 which
14 basically is no further action, which would mean the continued
15 operation of the existing on site and off site groundwater
16 recovery systems with no further additional pumping or treating
17 of the water. That would cost approximately \$160,000.

18 Secondly, GW-2 is limited action which would
19 basically put institutional controls to minimize future use of
20 the contaminated groundwater in the area. That would cost
21 \$260,000.

22 Next is groundwater three. This is EPA's preferred
23 alternative, by the way, and includes groundwater recovery and
24 treatment on and off site chemical treatment metals, in addition
25 to what is occurring now at the property to address the

AR500007

1 contamination chemical treatment for metals; that covers air
2 stripping for the organic emissions controls and discharge of
3 treated water to Lycoming Creek. That would cost \$9,300,000.
4 These are all estimated costs and they could very well change in
5 the future.

6 The next alternative is Groundwater Four, is
7 groundwater -- basically the same as number three and includes
8 groundwater recovery on site and off site, chemical treatment
9 for metals, and instead of air stripping we would have a process
10 called chemical oxidation to take care and treat the organic
11 contaminants, then the treated groundwater would be discharged.

12 And lastly Groundwater Five, again, groundwater
13 recovery on site and off site, in addition to what is now
14 occurring at the property, chemical treatment for metals, air
15 treatment, emission controls, reinjection and discharge of the
16 treated water, as well as in-situ biological treatment,
17 basically meaning biological treatment in the aquifer itself by
18 adding nutrients to the treated groundwater injected back into
19 the aquifer trying to treat the plume as it remains under
20 ground.

21 The reason for selecting the alternative GW-3
22 basically is based on the cost, is quite cost effective as
23 related to GW-4, and -- by the way GW-1 and GW-2 weren't even
24 considered because obviously they wouldn't deal with any further
25 remediation area than what is going on. GW-3 was selected, as I

AR500008

1 stated, based on cost, its implementability. As related to GW-4
2 and 5, it is cheaper than GW-4 by \$700,000 and over three
3 million dollars cheaper than five, and we can effectively get
4 the same results by using GW-3, and it is a proven technology.

5 Let me remind you that during the comment period we
6 have received or we expect to receive comments from Avco
7 Lycoming based on a meeting that we held with them where they
8 gave an argument as to why we should not include off site
9 groundwater, additional off site groundwater and recovery
10 treatment. At this time we're strongly considering those
11 comments, and as a result, this may lead us to not having the
12 additional off site groundwater recovery and treatment at the
13 time the final decision is made. Unless -- this doesn't
14 necessarily mean additional off site recovery and treatment
15 would not occur. It just means that we may wait until
16 additional information comes forth, both through the results of
17 the on site system as well as additional investigations to
18 determine again the nature and extent of contamination that
19 we're dealing with. That decision ultimately will be made by
20 the time the record of decision is issued at the end of June.
21 If we do include the off site groundwater recovery and treatment
22 at this time during the design phase of that decision we will
23 determine exactly where and how many recovery wells to place in
24 the off site recovery scheme. And with that I'll open up the
25 floor for any questions that anyone may have.

1 MS. BARNETT:

2 Do we have any questions?

3 MR. BARR:

4 Jim Barr, Sun Gazette here in Williamsport. What is
5 the basis of your estimate of the cost for these things?

6 MR. DENNIS:

7 The costs were put together by the consultant working
8 for Avco Lycoming. I can only respond to you further exactly
9 what they used to put together their cost, and I am not quite
10 sure -- I am sure it's through years of experience and practice
11 in this field, and how they determine the cost of recovery,
12 well, for example, could be placed the cost of drilling and etc.

13 MR. BARR:

14 Roughly twenty-year treatment plan?

15 MR. DENNIS:

16 It could very well be as long as twenty years,
17 possibly longer.

18 MS. CICHOWICZ:

19 They base the costs on thirty years. They base the
20 cost on thirty years operation of the system, and they did a
21 preliminary design of the -- of on site and off site recovery
22 wells, but it was for thirty years.

23 MR. BARR:

24 What is the ultimate objective points which you want
25 to reach at the end of that thirty-year period in terms of

AR500010

1 contamination?

2 MR. DENNIS:

3 We'd like to achieve clean-up goals as identified in
4 the record of decision which would basically be background
5 clean-up goal, that is groundwater concentration of the
6 contaminants in the ground level equivalent to those
7 concentrations that have not been impacted, for example, by the
8 site or the maximum contaminant levels as spelled out by EPA or
9 risk levels, whichever is the lowest.

10 MS. BARNETT:

11 Do we have other questions?

12 MS. YOUNG:

13 Robin Young, WRAK. Regarding the off site clean-up,
14 would that affect residents at all? It's surrounded by
15 residential areas.

16 MR. DENNIS:

17 No, it's not, other than impacts due to drillers
18 coming in and installing the wells or whatnot, but I am not sure
19 what kind of impact you're directing your question at, but --

20 MS. YOUNG:

21 I didn't know if any work would be done on
22 properties.

23 MR. DENNIS:

24 We really don't know right now. Again, that's based
25 -- those decisions are made in the design phase where we would

AR500011

1 determine the most appropriate locations to install the wells.

2 MS. BARNETT:

3 Do we have other questions?

4 MR. BITTLE:

5 Yep. Dick Bittle. What's the depth of the
6 groundwater in this area?

7 MS. CICHOWICZ:

8 Less than twenty feet.

9 MR. BITTLE:

10 Less than twenty.

11 MS. BARNETT:

12 Do we have other questions from the audience?

13 Anyone. Yes?

14 MR. OCHS:

15 Michael Ochs, O-C-H-S. In the administrative record
16 filed fact sheet you indicate how the document index was put
17 together and it's to include six items. I was wondering, the
18 four or five and six are not included. Does that come later or
19 don't they apply in this case: removal, community involvement,
20 progressional correspondence, imagery and site condition?

21 MS. BARNETT:

22 What that means, when we put together an
23 administrative record it contains all the documents that we used
24 to come up with the clean-up alternatives and then to actually
25 include the alternative that's going to be used. What it means

AR500012

1 is that in those particular three categories no documents were
2 utilized in coming up with these alternatives. If they were to
3 be used from here on in, before we make the decision those would
4 be added to the administrative record.

5 MR. OCHS:

6 You use the Avco consultant estimate on the cost and
7 don't make an independent appraisal?

8 MR. PIKE:

9 We'll be doing an independent cost estimate to
10 confirm the cost before our record decision is made, yes.

11 MR. OCHS:

12 For alternative three?

13 MR. PIKE:

14 Yes.

15 MR. OCHS:

16 I looked at the data in the library. In volume one,
17 site identification, page AR10001, first page, field trip
18 summary report, section 4-B says the southern land use is
19 industrial. Well, it seems to me that residential land
20 surrounds the site. It seemed to be an error on the first page.

21 MS. BARNETT:

22 Do you remember what the date of that document was,
23 that particular page?

24 MR. OCHS:

25 You don't bring them with you?

AR500013

1 MS. BARNETT:

2 No, we don't.

3 MR. DENNIS:

4 That, I believe, is when the preliminary
5 identification of the site was made based on the preliminary
6 assessment, desk top assessment which I would guess is around
7 six or seven years old.

8 MR. OCHS:

9 I mean the residence has not changed. I assume
10 you're talking about the Avco site or talking about the plume
11 area.

12 MR. DENNIS:

13 What they're talking about in that particular
14 document I am not sure.

15 MR. OCHS:

16 It's the first page of your document.

17 MR. DENNIS:

18 It wasn't remedial investigation, it was the first
19 page of the report, I believe you're talking about, correct?

20 MR. OCHS:

21 Page AR10001 of the site identification called field
22 trip summary report.

23 MR. DENNIS:

24 That is a summary report of a -- during the
25 identification process they do a preliminary assessment. Those

AR500014

1 assessments basically -- that obviously is an error. At the
2 time it was done it may not have been; however, it must have
3 been there. May have been a misjudgment due to the person
4 writing the report.

5 MR. OCHS:

6 Near the end of the documents on file, beginning on
7 page AR30348, it says alternative three is preferred. Yet, in
8 the newspaper article on April 17th you indicate alternative
9 four is preferred. Again, this is confusing because I seem to
10 detect an error on the first page of the data, and near the very
11 end of the six volumes it's hard to read what's in between, but
12 I seem to find, you know, confusion at the beginning and at the
13 end.

14 MS. BARNETT:

15 You're talking about -- when you say it was in a
16 newspaper article it was an article or was it in a --

17 MR. OCHS:

18 Your paid advertisement.

19 MS. BARNETT:

20 I don't have those two documents in front of me. It
21 may be that the substance of each one, whether it is labeled
22 alternative three or alternative four, is the same.

23 MR. OCHS:

AR500015

24 I believe that might be the case but it's confusing
25 for the layperson trying to understand it. Everything in

1 between is very technical and difficult for the layperson to
2 understand. Now, your memo, Mr. Dennis, of April 26th, which
3 the library received April 29th, referred to incorrect risk
4 value. Was -- I take it you meant incorrect risk value use in
5 that, and new information then was added a few days ago which
6 seems to lower the health risks, that is the carcinogenic risks,
7 as I understand it. I am just a layperson, reduces it, for
8 example. In one case from 953,000 extra chances out of a
9 million to 50,000 chances. In another case it's reduced from
10 989,000 extra chances out of one million to 20,000 chances.
11 That's on pages six and seven of this document, corrected
12 version you've placed in the library just a couple of days ago.
13 Figures can lie and liars can figure, as we know, but it would
14 be interesting to know why the sudden change in toward a lesser
15 risk assessment. It -- my further study revealed higher
16 figures, higher risks, or might in the future EPA minimal levels
17 of acceptance would be lowered?

18 MR. DENNIS:

19 Let me defer to our toxicologist.

20 MS. FORMAN:

21 The first thing I want to emphasize, the error was a
22 simple transcriptional error. It had nothing to do with
23 calculations at all. It was just a transcriptional error from
24 the RI to the proposed plan. That's the first thing.

25 The second thing is, is that all of the risks that

1 are highlighted in the document refer to future risks. There
2 are no current risks posed by this site.

3 MR. OCHS:

4 That's another question. I mean, ordinarily when
5 people think of superfund site they think of some risk to the
6 environment, to public health, safety. You might explain how
7 this is an exception to that perception.

8 MS. FORMAN:

9 It's not an exception. The risks state the risks to
10 public health. Those are the risks to public health of an
11 individual contracting cancer. These are the probabilities of
12 their risks if exposed to the contaminants at the site at those
13 concentrations. Again, you understand that there are no current
14 risks. People are not currently exposed to these
15 concentrations, but the Superfund Program mandates we also
16 protect people from -- people in the future who may come to the
17 site at a later point in time and thereby can be exposed to the
18 same concentrations if we were not to do anything at the site.
19 Therefore, we evaluate both current exposure risks as well as
20 future -- extrapolating those data to the future case. Does
21 that make it clearer?

22 MR. OCHS:

23 You seem to be saying there's no risk at the present.
24 People would say, then why bother doing anything?

25 MS. FORMAN:

AR500017

1 Because there's contaminating groundwater and we
2 don't only consider risks to human health, but we also consider
3 risks to the environment, and the risk to the environment is the
4 preservation of the groundwater and the drinking water source
5 for the same.

6 MR. OCHS:

7 Is that indirectly a risk to the population?

8 MS. FORMAN:

9 In the future.

10 MR. OCHS:

11 But not over the past; there has been no risk by
12 consuming this water?

13 MS. FORMAN:

14 Nobody has been consuming this. That's the point.
15 Nobody has been consuming the water which is contaminated. The
16 contaminated water is on site. The off site residents are
17 exposed to water from a municipal water supply.

18 MR. OCHS:

19 This is also the reserve water system for the city?

20 MS. FORMAN:

21 Right, but--

22 MR. OCHS:

23 It's been used in the past. People have consumed
24 water from this well field.

25 MS. FORMAN:

AR500018

1 But the well field is not contaminated.

2 MR. DENNIS:

3 Well, the well field is contaminated; however, the
4 water drawn from the contaminated well field is treated to
5 nondetectible levels before it is put into the line for the
6 people to consume.

7 MR. OCHS:

8 You don't have any history to when this began before
9 it was treated? People could have been consuming this water.

10 MR. DENNIS:

11 That's a possibility.

12 MR. PIKE:

13 The basic risk assessment that is used for a base
14 line of the Superfund site is current use, and that risk
15 assessment shows there is no exposed populations currently. We
16 did not evaluate what happened in the past prior to public water
17 lines being extended, air stripping towers being built or
18 whatever. We look at what's current and what is potential for
19 future use.

20 MR. OCHS:

21 You have no history of how long this chemical has
22 been contaminating the reserve water system for the city?

23 MR. PIKE:

24 We did not evaluate the risks posed in the past.

25 MR. DENNIS:

AR500019

1 Obviously there is nothing we could do to address
2 that anyway, but we can address it in the future. That's what
3 we propose to do.

4 MR. OCHS:

5 On page AR303424 you talk about the health effects of
6 the site, contaminants on the following potentially exposed
7 pollutions. Then you list some of those. I think that's in
8 this document, page five -- on page five, summary of site risks,
9 the bottom page, the full paragraph. Do you have any sense of
10 what the effect of deep breathing would be of the compounds of
11 volatilizing from on site soils and air strippings? For
12 example, there are tennis players and baseball and softball
13 players who play recreational near these towers now being
14 concerned about the emissions. Seems to me that -- you know, if
15 I am trying to change the focus now from the emissions in the
16 water as a dump site now to the emissions into the air as a dump
17 site; young children play at the original Little League Field
18 next -- adjacent to the air stripping tower, toddlers in the
19 wading pool at Memorial Park across the street. It seems to me
20 you're only considering Elm Park in this paragraph on page five.
21 Memorial Park is just across the street. In terms of air
22 emissions, people play there.

23 Also, is there any change in the effect of a person
24 from normal breathing to the kind of, you know, heavy breathing
25 you do when you exert yourself in recreational activities such

1 as the players at Bowman Field, for example?

2 MS. FORMAN:

3 The risk assessment calculation, the number that is
4 spit out of the risk assessment calculation depends on a number
5 of factors. One of those factors is how much a person breathes
6 per day. Many of the factors that are included in the
7 calculations are not representative of a normal person. They're
8 representative of a sensitive person, somebody who may have
9 asthma, for example, the elderly, some sensitive sub-populations
10 in addition to the risk calculation and the exposure parameters
11 that are conservative or overestimated, if you want to use that
12 term, are the relative toxicity factors or factors which are
13 based on the animal data derived in the laboratory which says
14 how toxic a compound is. Those compounds are -- those numbers
15 are also conservative, which is why at the end of each one of
16 the paragraphs which evaluate site risk there is a statement
17 that says even though these are the maximum risks it is a highly
18 conservative estimate, and the actual risk is probably much,
19 much less than what's stated here, but this is the absolute,
20 absolute maximum, so EPA takes the position of being
21 conservative in order to protect all -- all the sensitive
22 sub-populations that may be exposed to the contaminants.

23 MR. OCHS:

24 I was concerned about that. In the paragraph you
25 don't mention the sensitive sub-populations. You seem to

AR500021

1 exclude Memorial Park.

2 MS. FORMAN:

3 They're not included -- they're incorporated.

4 They're not specifically spelled out, but they're in the -- in
5 the calculations.

6 MR. OCHS:

7 People are concerned here, for example, about a
8 regional incinerator being proposed. Some people think the
9 wind only blows one way, but the wind around the air stripper
10 blow the emissions in different directions, not just to Elm
11 Park, as this paragraph suggests. Also, we've learned from this
12 regional incinerator being proposed, sometimes air inversion
13 sometimes flows. How would that affect emission intake in terms
14 of peoples' inhaling the emissions from --

15 MS. FORMAN:

16 It's my understanding that the air -- our air people
17 have taken a look at this report and have evaluated the maximum
18 areas where concentrations would occur, and in that respect they
19 would have taken into account any processes such as inversion.

20 MR. OCHS:

21 Do you have any information update when air inversion
22 occurs in this valley?

23 MR. DENNIS:

24 Not on hand, no, I don't, but I can certainly --

25 MR. OCHS:

AR500022

1 Is there any caution that contaminants not released
2 during such days, or isn't this a factor?

3 MR. PIKE:

4 Let me add a factor. The air emissions from the
5 stripping towers, is existing towers and there will be more than
6 likely future towers for expansion of towers to accommodate the
7 proposed additional volumes of water to be treated. There is
8 approximately a year long design phase before anything is -- new
9 is brought on line. During that design there is an analysis of
10 the potential emissions from those stripper towers, and any
11 required controls for air emissions would be added on.

12 MR. OCHS:

13 That would be announced before your late June record
14 of decision?

15 MR. PIKE:

16 The record of decision would identify the standards
17 that it would have to meet, the air emission standards, whatever
18 they may be, and then the decision would have to meet those
19 limits.

20 MR. OCHS:

21 Any other alternatives besides changing the direction
22 of these toxics from groundwater to air? Can we keep them from
23 what water treating -- you're trying to get them out of the
24 groundwater to protect water environment. Can you protect the
25 air environment?

1 MS. FORMAN:

2 There's going to be some controls put on top of the
3 air strippers to prevent volatilization of the compounds during
4 the stripping process.

5 MR. OCHS:

6 And you would use the best available technology?

7 MS. FORMAN:

8 Absolutely.

9 MR. OCHS:

10 Would money be available ten, twenty, thirty years
11 hence if better technology becomes available?

12 MS. FORMAN:

13 I believe if better technology is available, correct
14 me if I'm wrong, if better technology is available there's
15 always the option of using that.

16 MR. PIKE:

17 We would identify the standards in the record
18 decision that would have to be met. Those standards would be
19 the ones applied for future use unless we find in the future
20 that health effects are more of a concern than what they
21 currently are. If there's new exposure information or new
22 toxicity information that comes up, then we have the ability to
23 go back and re-examine whatever controls are placed on these
24 types of units in addition to the standard design process and
25 concern over what limits would be put on the stripping towers or

AR500024

1 any kind of control technology. There is also in Superfund a
2 built-in five-year review where at the minimum of after five
3 years of operation of the system EPA comes back and re-examines
4 the whole site to determine if the remedy is still protective,
5 and if it is not, at that time then it certainly will be
6 readressed.

7 MS. BARNETT:

8 We'd use whatever technology that would work for us
9 to meet the standards. If something was still working well for
10 us and new technology came up, as long as that old technology is
11 still meeting the standards, we'd probably continue to use that.

12 MR. OCHS:

13 The fish in the river, the creek that are fished and
14 eaten, apparently that would pose no threat to human health.
15 There's going to be a demonstration compost patch next to the
16 air stripping tower, apparently wouldn't affect any vegetable
17 gardens. I am asking that question. Firehouseworkers next to
18 the air stripping tower, not adversely affect workers there, or
19 neighbors. Has there been any epidemiological study of cancer
20 rates in the site area?

21 MR. DENNIS:

22 There's currently a health assessment being done by
23 the Pennsylvania Health Department at this time. That study
24 will be available, I believe, sometime in the summer or early
25 fall where -- and there are epidemiologists involved in that

AR500025

1 study, so that is basically called a health survey, health
2 survey assessment of the Avco Lycoming facility site in
3 conjunction with EPA's action and study being taken into the
4 site. That will be available for public review as soon as it's
5 released.

6 MR. OCHS:

7 Do you have a name or department? Is this the local
8 Department of Health?

9 MR. DENNIS:

10 It's the Pennsylvania Department of Health. They
11 have regional offices, one which is here in Williamsport, I
12 believe. Larry, help me out.

13 MR. NEWCOMER:

14 Frank Bercovich, the Regional Office of the
15 Pennsylvania Health Department, is in charge of that study, or
16 at least involved in it.

17 MR. OCHS:

18 Is Avco or will any other agency do an
19 epidemiological study of health among workers on site who are
20 nearest the actual chemicals being used?

21 MR. DENNIS:

22 Not that I am aware of at this time. I am not
23 familiar with any of that. That doesn't mean they're not, but I
24 am certainly not aware of any being conducted.

25 MS. BARNETT:

AR500026

1 That would probably be on an Occupational Safety and
2 Health Administration type study if workers were being placed at
3 risk. Specifically we are talking about workers in an active
4 facility.

5 MR. OCHS:

6 EPA has made no assessment of whether workers are at
7 risk?

8 MR. DENNIS:

9 Nothing more than the evaluation of the risk
10 assessment that was performed.

11 MR. OCHS:

12 That was risk assessment as a result of anatomated,
13 not worker. I would suggest that since I found a mistake at the
14 beginning and confusion at the end that -- and it's so difficult
15 to read what's in between, and many laypeople who lack an
16 understanding of it, could we ask for an extension of the
17 comment period of, say thirty days until June 17th or perhaps to
18 May 29th which would be thirty days following Mr. Dennis's
19 addenda that was received here April 29th? Or even more, could
20 we ask for some technical assistance for the lay community to
21 understand exactly what the six volumes represent in terms of a
22 threat to community health and safety, environmental quality of
23 the air and water? Aren't grants available for technical
24 assistance so we could get -- understand the alternatives and
25 have public information sessions where the six volumes could be

AR500027

1 interpreted to interested community parties, therefore, delay
2 the record of decision until such technical advice is available
3 to the community?

4 MS. BARNETT:

5 There were several points you brought up in that and
6 I can address some of them. The first of which we do understand
7 that technical information can be hard for the layperson to
8 understand. That is in fact one of the reasons why we hold
9 meetings such as this so we can explain exactly what's in there
10 and answer any questions that may arise from people who look at
11 it.

12 Another thing is that something called a technical
13 assistance grant is available for laypersons, and what it is is
14 that EPA has the capacity to award a grant in the amount of
15 \$50,000 to a qualified citizens group that, you know, is in
16 existence for the purpose of studying the site who is interested
17 in the site and, you know, there is an application process
18 there, and there can be some work involved in doing the
19 accounting, but as far as I know, anybody who has applied for
20 that and who is qualified to receive it has received it. I
21 would be quite happy to send you information about that. If you
22 have your name on the mailing list I'll do that.

23 MR. OCHS:

24 What's the best timing for that -- timing for that
25 process?

AR500028

1 MS. BARNETT:

2 The best timing for that process honestly is probably
3 during the remedial investigation stage. Now, that stage is
4 obviously drawn to a close in this case; however, as far as I
5 know, there are no limitations as to when those awards can be
6 made.

7 MR. OCHS:

8 Is it our oversight in the community for not knowing
9 about this potential assistance being available?

10 MS. BARNETT:

11 No, it's not your oversight in the community for not
12 knowing about it.

13 MR. OCHS:

14 You're saying it might have been better earlier to
15 have it?

16 MS. BARNETT:

17 Yes, it probably would.

18 MR. PIKE:

19 There is a lag time from an application time and
20 there's matching funds, and there is a fairly detailed process
21 that has to be followed to obtain the grants, and because of the
22 timing involved with that, it is helpful to do that early on in
23 the process so that you have the expertise available for review
24 of documents like the ones that are in the administrative record
25 when they are placed there, so the timing -- may have missed the

AR500029

1 timing to be able to review these documents, but there may be --
2 if you're interested we can follow up, and there may be
3 assistance available for future reviews.

4 MR. OCHS:

5 Perhaps maybe we should have been informed of this
6 availability sooner.

7 MS. BARNETT:

8 That's possible, however, quite honestly there has
9 not been an abundance of public interest in this site.

10 MR. OCHS:

11 Is this the first or last hearing?

12 MS. BARNETT:

13 I don't know whether there were previous meetings
14 before this.

15 MR. DENNIS:

16 This is the first EPA has held.

17 MR. OCHS:

18 Will there be subsequent--

19 MR. DENNIS:

20 We don't have a plan --

21 MS. BARNETT:

22 If there is a demand we'll hold them.

23 MR. OCHS:

24 I thought -- one other question on this. My
25 understanding is that some people actually have their own wells

AR500030

1 and are consuming or using water from these contaminated well
2 fields in an area called the Patch. Local people know that as
3 the foot of Rose Street, and apparently that's no longer being
4 -- people are no longer using water from these contaminated well
5 fields.

6 MR. DENNIS:

7 Not to our knowledge. Based on the remedial
8 investigation they've done a pretty thorough survey and
9 identified any users within the three-mile radius of the
10 facility.

11 MR. OCHS:

12 How many miles?

13 MR. DENNIS:

14 I believe it was a three-mile radius of the facility.

15 MR. OCHS:

16 You don't think water was ever used for food
17 processing?

18 MR. DENNIS:

19 I am not saying ever used. I don't think it's being
20 used currently.

21 MS. BARNETT:

22 Do we have any questions from anyone else in the
23 audience at this time?

24 MR. BARR:

AR500031

25 I have another -- Jim Barr from the Sun Gazette

1 again. Your summary here says that the alternatives include
2 limiting of future property use. Would you explain what that
3 means?

4 MR. DENNIS:

5 That's related to the facility itself. That --
6 that's related to the soil contamination that was found so we
7 can minimize the -- anyone going in there and digging up the
8 foundation and being directly exposed to the contaminated soils.

9 MR. BARR:

10 Doesn't restrict the kind of activities that Avco
11 or--

12 MR. DENNIS:

13 Not -- well, you're looking to use the word restrict.
14 We'd put controls on what they can do as far as any excavation,
15 for example.

16 MS. BARNETT:

17 Do we have other questions? Yes.

18 MR. NICHOLSON:

19 Walt Nicholson from Williamsport Municipal Water
20 Authority. You said that there had been some consideration by
21 EPA of not doing additional off site work pending an evaluation
22 of the effectiveness of the containment on site. In evaluating
23 that will you take into consideration the mass of contaminants
24 in the bloodrock members between the plant site and Third Street
25 and the approximate travel time and contamination of that

1 material in that area? In other words, would a period of --
2 short of a year or two be sufficient time to be able to evaluate
3 that strategy?

4 MR. DENNIS:

5 We're thinking now at least a year, if not two,
6 preferably two years of operation of the on site -- new on site
7 system as identified in and described would be used to model,
8 for example, the massive transport of that plume between the
9 facility boundry and Third Street, for example, and get an idea
10 of exactly what we're dealing with, if we can put a number on
11 it. Sometimes that's very difficult, and using that information
12 as well as additional risk assessment for the off site, come up
13 with a plan to most appropriately effectively capture, recover
14 and treat that on site contaminated plume.

15 MR. NICHOLSON:

16 Would the evaluation expense of doing that sort of
17 thing actually be as much as, you know, a certain modest amount
18 of off site additional recovery down in the Elm Park area?

19 MR. DENNIS:

20 At this time I am not sure I understand the question.

21 MR. NICHOLSON:

22 I think that, you know, when you look at the -- some
23 of the dollar expense on studies up to this point, will
24 additional studies be cost effective relative to actual
25 additional off site clean-up?

AR500033

1 MR. DENNIS:

2 It's hard to say now. We think it would be because
3 it would better help us to exactly pinpoint where most
4 effectively we could place additional off site recovery where it
5 would be most effective in recovering that plume and enhancing
6 the clean-up time period, we'd think, hope to think additional
7 studies would be beneficial for the clean-up period.

8 MR. NICHOLSON

9 Another question. Some of our data indicates, I
10 think, figure 530 on an overhead where the south end of the
11 plume was extrapolated and shown to essentially end at Third
12 Street. If you put that back up, I would think right there,
13 it's our experience that extends west across Lycoming Creek
14 impacting our well No. seven and also continues on the east side
15 of the creek, all the way down to and including our well No. 10
16 off the bottom of the picture there. Would it be advisable to
17 consider the expansion of monitoring the wells used in the
18 further evaluation in the next few years to include more points
19 in and around the public water supply well field?

20 MR. DENNIS:

21 I think it would be -- I think we'll take that under
22 strong consideration, not only to consider additional recovery
23 in the vicinity of Elm Park or Third Street as a result of the
24 one year or two years of operations of the on site system, but
25 to also, based on some of the results we've come up with the

AR500034

1 same questions. How far beyond Lycoming Creek, if at all, does
2 this plume extend? And I think we'd certainly want to
3 investigate that and see where the boundries of the plume really
4 do go, so we'll certainly consider that part of the
5 investigation to include that in the investigation -- in the --
6 in future investigations.

7 MS. BARNETT:

8 Do we have other questions? Yes.

9 MR. BARR:

10 When do you expect this clean-up process to be
11 initiated?

12 MR. DENNIS:

13 We'd hope that within two years of the ROD.
14 Certainly we'd have an operational groundwater recovery and
15 treatment system.

16 MS. BARNETT:

17 The ROD is the record of decision. Any other
18 questions?

19 MR. OCHS:

20 Michael Ochs. You say after Avco's already made some
21 comment to you in writing about prefers only on site as opposed
22 to further off site treatment?

23 MR. DENNIS:

24 Correct.

25 MR. OCHS:

AR500035

1 Are those comments included in the six volumes on
2 file?

3 MR. DENNIS:

4 They were just received. We anticipate receiving
5 further ones in the future. They'll be included in the response
6 of the summary as well as answered in the response of the
7 summary.

8 MR. OCHS:

9 When is the responsive summary to be issued?

10 MR. DENNIS:

11 That will be part of the record of decision.

12 MR. OCHS:

13 Late June?

14 MR. DENNIS:

15 Late June.

16 MR. OCHS:

17 My inquiry about extending the comment period and the
18 record of decision date in the event that a community group
19 comes forward to apply for a technical assistance grant --

20 MR. DENNIS:

21 An extension will be considered.

22 MS. BARNETT:

23 Do we have other questions?

24 MR. NICHOLSON:

25 Relative to the off site pumping on Third Street

AR500036

1 recovery well, they're presently pumping at a thousand gallons a
2 minute or so. Has any consideration or study been given to the
3 potential of actually pulling more contaminants into the
4 immediate well field area due to the high pumping rate that not
5 -- normally that would have come over that way from other areas
6 around there? Would a consideration be given to any other off
7 site wells that might have a potential of -- to have that
8 pumping rate lowered to a lower level, that maybe would not
9 cause the point of depression to be quite that extended as it is
10 now. There's another point to not potentially impact on the
11 capacity of the public water supply well field with the width
12 and extent of that ton of depression at this time. If we'd use
13 the well field to its maximum capacity, there's some concern
14 that that would limit our recharge potential and availability of
15 groundwater there.

16 MR. DENNIS:

17 The Third Street well in itself would limit the
18 recharge capacity.

19 MR. NICHOLSON:

20 That code of depression for that overlaps a number of
21 our wells. The old well No. nine would maybe be put back into
22 use, having the use of contaminants were discovered, well seven,
23 well three and to some extent well four.

24 MS. CICHOWICZ:

25 I think they're pumping now at 650 gallons per minute

AR500037

1 rather than a thousand.

2 MR. NICHOLSON:

3 Recently I think one of the comments in the ERM
4 material indicated it was still going at a thousand. The fact
5 it has been cut back closer to seven hundred, I think that
6 evaluation of continuation of that rate should include impact on
7 the potential capacity of our well field.

8 MR. DENNIS:

9 That can be done.

10 MS. BARNETT:

11 Do we have other questions?

12 MR. OCHS:

13 Have you made any study of the -- I am -- again, I am
14 changing my focus from the water to the air, trying to preserve
15 the quality of both. Have you made any study of the effect of
16 the addition of the chemicals released by air stripping that
17 those chemicals add to what Avco already releases? Their toxic
18 release inventory sheets indicates they're still releasing a
19 number of toxics into the air. BroDart at Oliver and Scott
20 Street has air emissions. Glyco across the creek there is an
21 industrial park, annually report their toxic sheets any
22 synergistic effect of all this mingling together during an air
23 inversion, for example?

24 MR. DENNIS:

25 We haven't evaluated synergism at this point. We can

AR500038

1 certainly consider that would be done.

2 MR. OCHS:

3 You also have Route 15, 220 bypass there, a lot of
4 auto truck emissions.

5 MS. BARNETT:

6 Do we have other questions?

7 Okay, I'd like to thank everybody for coming. Is
8 there anything --

9 MR. PIKE:

10 I want to reiterate and thank you for coming and also
11 thank you for the questions, because there's been some very good
12 ones and some of 'em we'll also give additional answers to at
13 the -- in the responsiveness summary. I want to reiterate this
14 is a proposed plan that everyone has in front of them, and
15 public comments are very important to us in our ultimate
16 decision of what remedial action is necessary for this site.

17 MS. BARNETT:

18 If anybody has any questions they'd like to see us
19 about afterwards, we are going to be here if you have anything
20 you want to know.

21 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

AR500039

1 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA :

2 : SS.

3 COUNTY OF LYCOMING :

4
5
6
7 I, Dawn M. Sweeley, a Notary Public in and for
8 said Commonwealth and County do hereby certify that the witness
9 named in the foregoing deposition was personally sworn by me at
10 the time and place designated for the taking of the said
11 deposition; that this is a true and correct copy of the notes
12 taken by me at the time and place set for the taking of the
13 deposition; that I have no interest whatsoever in the outcome of
14 these proceedings.
15
16
17

18 
19 Notary Public

20 My Commission Expires: _____
21
22
23
24
25

AR500040